



BAP
R429

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10547

27/2/1851

46

51

7/1/1851

100
Pasbury Nat asiel J. S. Rector of H. Paul. Lindwell.

A. S. E.

of the

of the

of the

of the

THE
C A S E

OF THE

Cross in Baptism
CONSIDERED.

Wherein is Shewed,

That there is nothing in it, as it
is used in the *Church of England*,
that can be any just Reason of
Separation from it.

Nathaniel Resbury

Galat. VI. 14. *God forbid that I should glory, save in
the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Fincham Gardiner*, at the *White-
Horse* in *Ludgate-street*. 1684.



SCB
1554

T H R

E A S E

O F T H E

C O U N T Y O F S U S S E X

C O N S T I T U T E D

W H I C H

W A S

1 7 8 4

J O H N D O W N

1 7 8 4

(I)

THE

CASE

OF THE

CROSS

IN

Baptism, &c.



THE Matters in Dispute betwixt Us and our Dissenting Brethren, may generally seem to the unconcern'd stander by, of so slight and Inconsiderable Moment, that he must needs wonder how in the World the Controversie should come to have arisen to that Deplorable height, which in this last Age it hath done. And although the *Case* which will fall under our present Debate, seems to have admitted of the most specious scruples and given the best scope of reasoning, of any other thing that hath fallen under question amongst us since the Reformation; yet even here also, the *Immeasurable* *Byass* of Prejudice, and Fervency of Opposition, hath too apparently manag'd the Argument. So that the Pleas against it have not seem'd so

*Αυστεία ἀνὰ
σοφίας.*

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

L. 5. c. 20.
*Infirmiora Ar-
 gumenta Con-
 greganda sunt,
 imbecilla enim
 natura, mutuo
 auxilio susti-
 nentur.*

weighty as they have been numerous, as if the Objectors had an Eye to that direction in *Quintilian*, they would be sure to amass all the weaker Arguments, which though weak in themselves, yet by standing together may lend a Mutual assistance to one another; like Articles of Impeachment, none of which singly would perhaps affect the accus'd Person, but all together may amount to accumulative Treason.

My business therefore in handling this *Case*, shall not be to follow every nice Scruple, or trivial Objection (as where the *Cross* in *Baptism* hath been charg'd with the breach of every particular Precept in the Decalogue) not to concern my self in any thing, which either by long Induction of consequences hath been far fetcht, or with great difficulty drawn in, to make a show of Argument, but, as briefly and plainly as may be to sum up all that hath ever seem'd of any Moment in this matter, and that under this twofold Head.

I. That the Sign of the *Cross* hath been so notoriously abus'd to the worst purposes of Superstition and Idolatry in the *Church of Rome*; that the retaining of it still amongst us, makes us partakers of the Superstitions and Idolatry of that *Church*.

II. That it seem's the introducing of a *New Sacrament*, which having not the warranty of our Lord and Master *Christ Jesus*, must needs be a very Offensive invasion of his Rights, whose Royal Prerogative alone it is to institute what *Sacraments* he pleaseth in his *Church*.

Under these two Heads I think may be fairly comprehended all those Objections our Brethren have offer'd against the Sign of the *Cross* in *Baptism*, at least all those that are any thing Material. Inasmuch that if the difficulty of these could be remov'd, we might fairly hope, none of the Sober and Conscientious Dissenters, but would

would think themselves oblig'd to submit to the use of it, rather than maintain the Separation upon this account.

And this shall be endeavour'd with all the Candor and Clearness that becomes the design of this, and the rest of those Discourses that have been Publish'd of this kind, *viz.* to Convince and not Reproach or Provoke any : to Effect (if possible) the happy agreement, and consequently enlarge and strengthen the interests of good Men. And for this purpose I have thought fit not to quote the writings of particular Persons, but rather to represent the Objection, as what is in general avow'd and agreed upon by the whole Party.

And although it is not likely that any thing should be *here* offer'd, that hath not been already with great Learning and Integrity made use of, by the many assertors of *our Church*; yet perhaps, the bringing this under one view, without the *Warmth* or *Salt* of an Adversary may not prove altogether Vain and Ineffectual.

I. I begin therefore, with the first Objection, *viz.* *That the Sign of the Cross hath been so notoriously abus'd to the worst purposes of Superstition and Idolatry in the Church of Rome, that the retaining of it still amongst us, makes us Partakers of the Superstitions and Idolatry of that Church.*

I must readily acknowledg that the Material Figure of the *Cross* hath been indeed abus'd to very *Idolatrous* purposes in the *Church of Rome*, and even the aerial Sign of it to Purposes superstitious and ridiculous enough, and if what we do in using this Sign in Baptism, were really chargeable with *Popery*, it would be a sufficient reason to detest and Reject it. The Objection therefore at the first view looks plausibly enough, when it thus chargeth this Ceremony of the *Cross*; Paganism it self being hard-

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

ly more Odious, nor in Truth (for some very good Reasons amongst wise Men,) more Ridiculous and Intolerable. There is scarce any part of *Popery*, properly so called, but is so plain a depravation of Christianity it self, such a contradiction to the Rules, such a defeat to the great purposes and ends of our *Holy Religion*, that it deserves well enough the good Mans Justest abhorrence, which he may reasonably exprefs, when he finds himself in any real danger of the Snare. But then, we must consider, how easie and natural a thing it is for Persons (that otherwise mean honestly enough) to humour a Just and Reasonable Offence against *Popery*, into groundless Suspicions upon things which have no such Tendency at all in them : And upon these first Suspicions not only to startle, and grow a little shy and nice, but to determine themselves in resolv'd & unmoveable Prejudices; that have had Effects ill enough. For upon this, designing Men have made their advantage upon every trifling occasion, giving out the word, and laying the charge of *Popery*, upon what it hath been their humour or interest to desire a change in. And this probably we shall find to have happen'd in this *Case* in hand. The accusation hath been drawn against it that it is very *Popish*, and the Prejudices which this Accusation hath begot in some honest Minds, are so strong that they seem invincible. How unreasonably therefore this charge is laid against our use of the *Sign of the Cross* in Baptism may appear when we have considered these three things.

I. That the use of this Sign was much more ancient, than the first Corruption and Depravation of the *Church of Rome*.

II. That the use of it, as it is ordain'd and appointed in our *Church*, hath not the least affinity with the use of it, as it is in the *Romish* Rituals.

III. Last.

III. Last. Although it cannot be deny'd but the *Church of Rome* hath greatly abus'd this Ceremony to very ill purposes of Superstition, yet doth not this make it unlawful to continue the Reform'd use of it still amongst us that have professedly separated from the Corruptions of *that Church*.

I. Consider we that the use of this Sign of the *Cross* was much more ancient than the first Corruption and Depravation of the *Church of Rome*. When I speak of the *first Corruption and Depravation* of the *Church of Rome*, I would be understood as to those things that have put *that Church* under the Imputation of what we now call *Poper*y. For that there were some deprav'd Customs crept into the *Church* in general (and so that of *Rome* perhaps as well as any other) in very early days, is Evident from what *St. Paul* Rebukes in the *Church of Corinth*, and from what our Saviour himself in his *Revelations* to *St. John*, Condemns in the Seven *Churches of Asia*. So that, when I say the use of the *Cross* was more ancient than the first Corruption and Depravation of the *Church of Rome*, I mean, more ancient than any of those Corruptions in her by the reason of which, we have justly esteem'd her an *Apostatiz'd Church*, more ancient than either the Introduction of Images, their Multiplication of Sacraments, their pretensions to Supremacy and Infallibility, or any of those Superstitious Rites in Worship, by which we distinguish *that Church* as *Popish*, and brand it as false and *Antichristian*.

As to this therefore, I know none of our Dissenting Brethren, however for a shift in Argument they may talk of the *Mystery of Iniquity* beginning to work betimes, and in the first Ages of the *Church* *, that yet do professedly charge any *Signal Apostasy* upon the *Church of Rome*, at least for the first four hundred Years after *Christ* : not

By which Phrase the Apostle in Truth meant, the Secret workings of the Hereticks of that Age.

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

to the Age wherein *St. Austin* Flourish'd; but that it was a Church that might be Communicated with at that time, notwithstanding *that* Father complain'd of the Superfétation of Ceremonies even then, which (at least for the Number of them) began to be very burdenson. And yet, for an Hundred or two of Years before this, we find in the Writings of *Tertullian* such mention of the use of *this* Sign, that makes it very plain, it had been a Customary thing long before his time also, and probably, even amongst those of the Apostolical Age it self. There are those indeed that would make that Father the first that brought in the use of this Ceremony into the Church, having receiv'd it from the *Montanists* of whom he seems to have been particularly fond. But the frequent and familiar mention he makes of the Sign of the Cross in many of his Books renders this Conjecture very improbable. *Tertullian* tells us it was grown so much in use in his time, that upon every motion of theirs, at their going out and coming in, when they put on their Garments or Shooes, at the Bath, or at Meals when they lighted up their Candles, or went to Bed, whatever almost they did in any part of their Conversation, still they would even wear out their Foreheads with the Sign of the Cross; which though he confesseth there was no express Law of Christ that had enjoyn'd it, yet Tradition had Introduc'd, Custom had Confirm'd, and the Believers Faith had observ'd and maintain'd it.

Frontem crucis
signaculo tere-
re. Tertul. de
Coron. mil.

This doth not look as if it had been a thing newly invented by *Montanus*, and brought into the Church by *Tertullian*, as being himself too great a Favourer of that Sect. Although, were it thus indeed, yet this sheweth that the Practice of it was receiv'd among the Faithful, some Ages before the Depravation and Apostacy of the *Romish Church*. But he is not our single Author in this
mat-

matter : for, *Origen* who Flourish'd not much above CC Years after Christ, and not XL Years after *Tertullian*, makes mention of those who upon their Admission into the Church by Baptism, were Sign'd with this Sign. And *St. Basil* not much above one Hundred Years after him, gives this usage the Venerable Title of an Ecclesiastical Constitution, or sixth Law of the Church, that had prevail'd from the Apostles Days, that those who believed in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, should be Sign'd with the Sign of the Cross.

Homil. 2. in
Psalm. 38.

Basil. de Spir.
Sancti. cap. 27.

But of all the Fathers, *St. Cyprian*, who was before *St. Basil*, and very near if not contemporary with *Tertullian* himself, not only speaks most Familiarly of the use of this Sign, but hath some Expressions in this matter, that would seem very harsh and unwarrantable now ; and yet, the Authority of that Father, hath sav'd him hitherto from being brought under question about it. He tells us in one place, that in *fronte cruce signantur, qui Dominum promerentur*, i.e. they are Sign'd in the Forehead with the Cross who are thought worthy of the Lord, and in another place, *Omnia sacramenta peragit, et Compleats every Sacrament, and per crucem baptisma sanctificatur, Baptism is Sanctified by the Cross.* I will not stand accountable for the Justifiableness of these passages, were they to be allow'd no kind of Latitude : but, as to the purpose for which they are cited they seem pertinent enough : that is, to Argue the antiquity of this usage (and that in the Sacrament of Baptism too) the Phrase so frequently occurring in the writings of those ancient Fathers, that *fronte signati, being sign'd in the Forehead,* seems a known and usual Periphrasis for being enter'd into the Faith of Christ and the Body of his Church by Baptism.

After all which, what need I Instance in *St. Cyril*, *St.*

Ambrose, or *St. Austin*? Who sprinkle their writings with the Common mention of this Ceremony, and oftentimes frame Arguments of the Obligation upon Christians to live as becomes them, from this very badge they wear upon their Foreheads. *St. Austin* wittily enough glorying in the *Confidence* of a Christian as to a *Crucifix'd Saviour*, that he willingly imprints the Sign of it upon that part of himself *which is the proper seat of Blushing*.

Nec nos pudet Crucifixi, sed ubi pudoris signum est, crucis ejus signum habemus. August. in Galat. c. 14.

I shall only add this remark further, that after the time wherein this Custom had been so Universally receiv'd into the Christian Church, and some of the Fathers had so liberally exprest themselves in it, we may observe that the first Christian Emperour, *Constantine the Great*, had his Directions probably from heaven it self to make this Sign, the great Banner in his Wars, with this Additional encouragement, that *by this he should overcome*. That this *Dream* or *Vision* (call it which we will, for Histories mention it differently) was from Heaven, and a thing of great reality, is Evident, from the success of that Princes Arms under it.

ἐν τῷ τῆς νίκης.

The Authors of the *Centuries* allow a considerable Signification in that Sign as given him from Heaven, as the future Standard he should fight under, *viz, that God had admonisht him by that Sign of the Cross, and the Motto added to it, by this thou shalt overcome, concerning the Knowledg and Worship of the true God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, in Memorial of which he took care to have it Painted on his Banner, that it might be as the Symbol of the Christian Religion.*

Cent. 4. cap. 13.

Now we would not suppose that our Blessed Lord would by so immediate a Revelation from Heaven, Countenance such a Rite as this, already receiv'd and made use of in the Church, giving it to *Constantine* both as a Symbol of his Profession, and Pledg of his future Victories, if he had resented it before as Superstitious or any

any way unwarrantable. This kind of Standard the Roman Emperours successively had born before them in their Warrs: nay, it is recorded that Julian himself (probably from what he had made some former Observations of,) could not forbear defending himself with this Sign, upon a mighty fright he was seiz'd with, while in the use of Magick Arts he went to have consulted with the Devil. This Nazianzen calls his *craving aid and refuge of him whom he had Persecuted*. Which, (by the way) might give us the modestly and caution of showing our selves too petulant against what it hath pleas'd our Lord Jesus in a Revelation from Heaven to give the Figure of, and the Holy Spirit also to signalize sometimes by very renown'd miracles, which those that consult Ecclesiastical Histories of best Authority cannot but be convinc'd of.

Theodoret.
Hist. l. 3. c. 3.

Orat. Cont.
Julian.

So that, we find the use of it very ancient, and the Effects of it very Memorable, Casaubon himself (no very fond Man of Rituals) calls it *Primitivæ Ecclesiæ Symbolum ejus fiduciæ quam in Christo & cruce ipsius, & passione ponebant*: a Symbol the Primitive Church used to denote that Confidence they had in Christ, his Cross, and Passion.

Exercit. in Ba-
renum.

I confess it would be a fond thing to endeavour, with some of the Romish Church, to trace up the Antiquity of the Cross, to the first Creation of Man, and so all along downward to the Actual Death of our Blessed Lord. They can spy out the Cross, in the Figure of a Man's Face, by the placing of the Nose betwixt the two Eyes, and much more in the Position of the whole Body of the Man with his Arms extended. They can discern it in the Sword in Paradise, and in the Cross stick that Noah's Dove brought back into the Ark, &c.

See the notes of
Laur. le bar
won Terrul.
advers. Mar-
cion. l. 3. p.
178, 179.

And indeed some of the Fathers bend their Imaginations something that way, and would fancy the Figure of

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

the Cross in *Moses* his stretching out his Arms whiles the Israelites were fighting with *Amalek*, in the *Paschal Lamb* when the *Spit* went through it, &c. which, however they were conceipts too much suiting that way of allegorizing that some of them were fond of, yet doth it at least confirm what I am now upon, I mean the ancient Reception of this Sign into the Primitive Church. Nay, I may further add, that in some of the passages they have of this kind, the hint they take may not deserve perhaps to be absolutely exploded, as if there were no weight or moment at all in it. I will crave leave to instance particularly in one thing which some of the Fathers do a little insist upon, and that is, that *Mark* in *Ezek. 9. 4.* that was to be set upon the Foreheads of the Men that sigh, &c.

This *Mark* in several of the ancient Versions is suppos'd to be the *Hebrew Tau*, which *St. Hierom* tells us was, in the Samaritan Character, like our T, and so made the figure of the *Cross*, from whence he Collects that this was *signum crucis quæ in Christianorum frontibus pingitur, a token of that Cross that is imprinted upon the Forehead of the Christian.* If *St. Hierom* be not mistaken in the Samaritan Character, his conjecture in the Application of it, is not very unjustifiable; because, as all the promises are in *Christ Jesus, yea, and in him Amen*: So, all the Prophecies of old, where they concern'd any signal advantages or deliverances to the Jewish Church had the assurance of them frequently confirm'd by some hint or Remembrance of the *Messiah*, that was afterward to be reveal'd. Thus in that Confirmation that *Isaiab* was to give to *Abaz* of his present deliverance from the Invasions of *Ephraim* and *Syria*, he gives him this Sign, *behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son.* How could that great Event that was not to come to pass of so many Ages after *Abaz* his Death, affect him, who stood in need of

2 Cor. 1. 20.

Isai. 7. 4.

of so immediate Deliverance, but that it was brought in as an instance, (not only that as God could bring about such a wonder, as the Birth of a Child from a Virgin, could as easily relieve *Judah* in its present streights: but further,) he that had so gracious a design toward them, as to send the *Messiah* amongst them, would in the Prospect he had to that, show now his particular regards for the Church at this time. In Analogy to this, might this passage in *Ezekiel*, look toward that mark which Christians in after Ages should wear upon their Foreheads, as a present Symbol of the escape of those that should be found *sighing for the Abominations that were then done in Israel*. And to this probably, may that *Seal of the living God* have some Reference, which was to be set upon the Foreheads of the Servants of God. Revel. 7. 2, 3. For, as they are there reckon'd up by the number of *twelve times twelve*, to signify that they are the true and genuine off-spring of the twelve Apostles; so, the *Seal of the Living God upon their Foreheads*, may point at the Figure of the Cross, to betoken them (though under the Prophetick Denomination of the *Jewish Tribes*) to be of the *Christian Church*. This I would not be suppos'd to lay any great stress of Argument upon, only offer the Conjecture to the Candor of the Reader.

And thus, having shewen the Antiquity of *this Sign*, as it was receiv'd into the Church long before the Corruptions of *Popery* appear'd in the World; I know but of one thing can be urg'd to take off the strength of what hath been hitherto said; and that is, that the Primitive Christians might probably take up this Custom of thus signing themselves, because they liv'd wholly amongst the Enemies of the Cross of Christ, the *Jews making the Cross a Stumbling-block, and the Greeks Foolishness*. So that, their design of doing it, was only to bear

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

bear their Testimony to the Faces of both, that is, tho the Cross was scandal to the one, and scorn and laughter to the other, yet they would not be ashamed of this Cross but made it the Badg of their Profession. Whereas we live in an Age and Nation, where (thanks be to God) there seems no such occasion, because Christianity is the Religion we openly and universally profess.

To this I answer, that this Objection being thus made, doth at least suppose the usage of the Cross not to be a thing that is in it self evil, because if so, no good end or design in using it could hallow the Action; so that the Ceremony is not Evil in its self, but that upon some weighty reasons, it might be brought into the Church, if so, then we might reasonably think, that the injunction of Authority in this Case, might Justifie the Practice of it. But much more, if the reason now alledg'd might be a just occasion for the Church in its first Ages to take the usage up, God knows the occasion may be as urgent still upon an Equally sad account: and that is, the Prophane and Atheistical Contempt that is thrown, not so much upon the *Sign* as the *Doctrine* of the Cross, by the pretended Wits of our Age. He hath a very slender concernment for the interests of Religion, that is not sensibly toucht with those Blasphemous Raileries he may every where meet with, upon the whole Scheme of Christianity, especially that which we make the great Foundation of our hopes and trust, *viz.* the Merits of our Saviours Cross and Passion. That the use of this Sign, if ever it was reasonable upon such a score as this, it is so now. And *St. Cyprians* Caution is strong and pertinent enough at this time of the day against all the Wit and Pride of the daring and haughty Atheist, *Muniatur frons, &c. Arm your Foreheads that the Seal of God may be kept safe.* q. d. Remember the Badg you took upon you in Baptism,

tism, and so long as you have that upon your Foreheads, never be asham'd or laugh't out of Countenance, as to the Memory of your Saviours Love, and the Foundation of your hopes lay'd in his Death and Passion.

And now, since it is so evident how Ancient a practice this hath been in the Christian Church: I would not have this part of the Argument pretended further than it was first design'd, which was only to show that this Ceremony hath nothing owing in it to that which we call *Poperly*, because it was establisht in the Church so long before that *Mystery of Iniquity* had its being. And tho' through the Antiquity of it (if warrantable at the first) it becomes so much the more Venerable, and might justly lay some restraints upon the modest Christian in his Censures against it; yet doth not this put it beyond the degree of an *indifferent Ceremony*, without which, the Sacrament of Baptism is declar'd by our Church as complete and perfected. Did the Antiquity of its practice make it necessary, it might prove as necessary almost in every Action of Life, as well as Baptism, because (as I have noted before) *Tertullian* tells us, it was once so used. No, it only gives us the warrant of doing it, because practis'd in the most incorrupt Ages of Christianity; and the necessity of keeping it still in use, lyes not so much in that it was the Custom of some Church, or Constitution of some Council in former days, as that it is the Custom of our Church now, and the appointment of our Governours. But,

Secondly, It is further considerable, that the use of the Cross as it is ordain'd and appointed in our Church, hath not the least affinity with the use of it, as it is in the *Romish Rituals*.

I. We do by no means allow any visible Images of a Crucif'd *Jesus*, so as to have the least concern in any part

part of our Worship. There is no mention of them in our Rubrick; there is hardly in any writings of the Doctors of our Church one passage to be found of that latitude, that Mr. Baxter amongst his calmest thoughts hath not adventur'd to say, that is, that a *Crucifix well befiteth the Imagination and Mind of a Believer*; nay further, that it is not unlawful to make an Image (and gives the instance particularly of a *Crucifix*) to be the *objectum vel medium excitans ad cultum Dei*, an Object or medium of our consideration, exciting our minds to Worship God. The sense of our Church is truly express'd in this matter by Mr. Hooker, who tells us that *between the Cross which Superstition honoureth as Christ, and that Ceremony of the Cross which serveth only for a sign of Remembrance, there is as plain and great a difference, as between those brazen Images which Solomon made to bear up the Cistern of the Temple, and that which the Israelites in the Wilderness did adore. Or between those Altars which Josias destroy'd, because they were Instruments of meer Idolatry, and that which the tribe of Reuben with others erected near the River Jordan to far other purposes.* Ours is no other than a meer transient, or (as others express it) aerial figure of the Cross, which comes not within the widest notion of an Image; or if it were so, is so very transient, that it abides not so long as to be capable of becoming any *Object or medium of Worship*, any further than any words we use in Worship may do.

2. The use even of this transient sign, bears no kind of Conformity or likeness with the use of it in the *Church of Rome*. They use it upon numberless occasions beside Baptism. If they enter in, or go out of Church, or a Friends House; when they say their Prayers, or are present at any Religious Solemnity. If startled at Thunder, taken in a storm, frighted with a spectrum, or are sur-

priz'd

Christian direct. Ecclesiastical Cases qu.
113. p. 875.
Ibid. p. 876.

Eccles. Pol. l. 5.
p. 348.

priz'd with any kind of Fear or Astonishment, they bless themselves still, and take refuge under this sign of the Cross, which they will make upon themselves. If they visit the sick, administer the extreme Unction, or indeed perform any of their other *Sacraments* (so call'd by them,) the transient sign of the Cross must begin and close all. But then, in the Sacrament of Baptism, the use of *this sign* is so exceedingly different, as well in the nauseous Repetitions of it before and afterward, in the Forehead, in the Mouth, and upon the Brest: as also, the Monstrous Significations according to the divers places whereon it is impress'd, that nothing can be more. Beside that it is not us'd at the *time*, nor with the *form of words* that we use it with. So that, there is not the least agreement betwixt us and them, either in the use, or in the significancy of this Ceremony; and so no reasonable offence can be taken at it, upon any Symbolizing of *ours* with the *Church of Rome* in it. All this might be further confirm'd by giving a particular view of the *Roman Ritual*, as to what respects their office for Baptism; but this is done by a better hand upon another *Case* of this kind.

Lastly, Although it cannot be deny'd but the *Church of Rome* hath greatly abus'd this Ceremony to very ill purposes of Superstition, yet doth not this make it unlawful to continue the reform'd use of it amongst us, that have profess'dly separated from the Corruptions of *that Church*. It is a Principle that some of our *Brethren* imagine they are very well fortify'd in, from some instances in the *Gld Testament*, viz. that whatever hath been abus'd to Idolatrous or Superstitious purposes, should *eo nomine* be abolish'd. But perhaps they would find this much more a question than they have hitherto presum'd, if they would consider, that if this Principle were true,

See *Case about the Ch. of Engl. Symbol. with the Ch. of Rome, p. 10. 11. 12.*

*Confess. Bohem.
Art. 15.*

it would go nigh to throw a scorn upon all or most fo the Reformations that have been made from the *Church of Rome*, for they do not seem to have govern'd themselves by this Rule. Some of them in their publick Confessions declaring, that they might lawfully retain such Rites or Ceremonies as are of advantage to Faith, the Worship of God, or Peace and Order in the Church, *though they had been introduc'd by any Synod, or Bishop, or Pope, or any other.*

It is a Principle that would render Christianity impracticable, because no Circumstance, no Instrument, no Ministry in Worship, but may have been some way or other abus'd and desecrated by *Pagan* or *Romish* Idolatries. It would make every Garment of what shape, or of what colour soever, unfit for use in our Religious services: for, not only the White, but the Red, the Green, and the Black, have been us'd (even for the significance of their respective colours) by the *Gentile*, or the *Romanist* to very superstitious purposes in divine Worship. It would condemn the Practice of those very Persons that would pretend this to be their Principle. For they have few of them carry'd it to that height as to abolish *Churches*, *Fonts*, or other *Utensils*, but have thought fit to make use of them in the same services of Religion as formerly, though not in those modes by which they were abus'd to Superstition and Idolatry. All which they should not do, if either the Principle had any real Foundation in it self, or they acted in any due consistency with the Principle they pretend.

That which our *Dissenting Brethren* urge, (as they think) of the greatest force and pertinency in this matter, is the example of *Hezekiah*, who when he found the *brazen Serpent*, which God himself had directed to be set up for the Healing of those that had been stung with

Fiery Serpents, abus'd to downright Idolatry : He would not endeavour to recover it to the first design of its preservation, that is, to keep it standing only as a memorial of Gods Power and goodness, who had done such great and beneficial things amongst them by it : but without any more ado, takes it away from all further view of the People, breaks it in pieces, and calls it *Nehushtan*, i. e. let's the People see it was a *thing of Brass* and nothing else.

2 Kings
XVI. 1. 4.

To this I answer, First, Although it is very natural to mankind to govern themselves more by example than precept, yet, Arguments fetcht from examples, generally are not the truest way of reasoning ; and that partly upon this very account ; namely, the proneness we have toward example, and Byass and Prejudice we may the easilier be drawn away with, upon that account. But chiefly, because in alledging examples, it is very rare that we can hit the Case perfectly right. It may be said of *Examples*, as it is of *Similitudes* ; they seldom do *Currere quatuor pedibus*, they do not perfectly reach the thing intended to be prov'd, but are so widely different, or defective in some one or other Circumstance, that there is not that parity of Reason that ought to be ; and the varying of Circumstances may much alter the Case. Which very thing apparently falls out in this very instance. For certainly, if the example be concern'd in any thing with respect to our practice, it may seem to prove nothing further than the necessity of taking away (not what hath been us'd only to Idolatrous purposes, but) what it self hath been, and at that instant is, a meer Idol. This was the Circumstance of the *brazen Serpent*, it was by Custom become a real Idol ; it had been so for a long time, was so at that instant ; when *Hezekiah* brake it to pieces : *to those days the Children of Israel did*

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

burn Incense unto it. So that, thus far perhaps this instance might affect us, that, were there any *Crucifix*, or material image of our Saviour upon the Cross, now standing, to which People for some Ages had given, and for the generality did still give divine honour; it would then indeed concern the Government, in their Reformation from the Idolatries of the *Church of Rome*, to take away and abolish *this* and all other *Images* of this kind. This perhaps answers the pattern pretty much, and copieth out *Hezekiah's* wise and good Action; and this accordingly is entirely done in *our Church*; there being no such *Image* abiding now amongst us, to which any adoration is publickly avow'd, or that can be pretended to have such snare in it, as to hazard any general Idolatry. What proportion doth our *Aerial sign of the Cross* (toward which there is no intention, nor indeed any possibility of giving any divine Worship,) what proportion doth this bear to the material figure of the *brazen Serpent*, to which they had for a long time actually burnt *Incense*, did it *to those very days*, and gave such Evidence of their Inveteracy in Idolatry, that there seem'd no moral likelihood of preventing it by any other course than breaking the *Idol* to pieces, and letting them see what a meer *lump of Brass* they had been Worshipping? But then,

2. If Example were a good way of Arguing, we find by *Hezekiah's* practice in other things, he did not think it an indispensable Duty in him to abolish every thing that had been made use of to Idolatry, if they did not prove an immediate snare at that time; for, as to Temples which *Solomon* had erected for no other end but the Worship of false Gods in them, *1 Kings 11. 7.* *Hezekiah* did not make it his business to destroy them, as being in his time forlorn and neglected things, of which no bad use was then made.

made. Although indeed King *Josiah* afterward (probably upon the encrease of Idolatry, and renewed use of those places) soued it expedient to lay them wholly waste. *2 Kings 23. 13.*

And thus much I have thought fit to say as to that first Head of Objection against the sign of the Cross, as it is cry'd out against as a *Relick of Popery*, and had been so deprav'd by the Superstitious use of it in the *Church of Rome*. I cannot but acknowledg this to be the weakest part of their plea against it; and probably our *Brethren* know it to be so too: yet, because it is most affecting amongst common People, and seems to have made the deepest impression upon those that are not so well fitted for profound and solid reasoning, I have chosen to be the larger here, that even the meanest capacities may see that the Sign of the Cross, as we use it, was not introduc'd by the *Church of Rome*, but was of a much ancienter date: That the use we make of it bears no Conformity at all with *that Church* in their using it: that by our different usage we keep at a sufficient distance; nay, perhaps are in less likelihood of falling into the Snare of their Communion, than if it had been utterly abolisht: In a word, that that very Principle, upon which the charge of *Popery* is laid as an Argument against the Cross, is it self weak and fallible; nor are we bound by any Precept or Example in Holy Writ, to throw off the use of any one thing meerly because the *Church of Rome* hath abus'd it. It hath prov'd a mighty inconvenience to the Church, that People have been thrown into so precipitant a Zeal of removing themselves to the utmost extreams from the *Church of Rome*, that they have been almost afraid to determine in any action or circumstance of Divine Worship, lest it should some way or other, have been Prophan'd and made unwarrantable by their practice.

This

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

This is that gave rise to the mischievous Enthusiasms in *Germany*, that ended in such bloody and barbarous Practises, as well as senseless and ridiculous Principles taken up and maintain'd by the Anabaptists there. I am loth to mention the horrid confusions of our own Age and Nation, which yet perhaps we were wrought up into by this very humour; I mean, a restless fondness for some additional refinements still, which our *Church* had not thought fit to make.

I cannot but inwardly reverence the Judgment, as well as love the Temper, of our first Reformers, who in their first Separations from *Rome*, were not nice or scrupulous beyond the just reasons of things. Doubtless they were in earnest enough, as to all true Zeal against the Corruptions of *that Church*, when they seal'd the well-grounded offence they took at them, with their warmest blood; and cheerfully underwent all the hardships that Primitive Christians signalized their Profession with, rather than they would intermix with *Rome*, in any usage of Worship, or Article of Faith that had the least savour of Idolatry, Superstition, or false Religion at all in it. And yet these Holy and Wise Men, when they had the Power and Opportunity of Reforming, wholly in their Hands, being equally jealous of *Enthusiasm* as they were of *Superstition*, would not give themselves up to those fantastick Antipathies as to abolish this or that Ceremony, merely because it had been in use amongst the *Papists*, if some other very substantial Reason did not put in its claim against it. And verily, had they not Governed themselves in these temperate and unbyast methods of Reformation, they would not so easily have justified themselves to their Adversaries, or the World; or have made it so evident (as by their wise management they did) that what was done by them was from the
meer

mere urgencies of Conscience and Reason, and not the wantonness of Change and Innovation. So that, where any mean honestly (as I doubt not but many of those do, that Dissent from us in this particular circumstance of the Cross in Baptism) they ought to have their Reason very well awake, that the meer charge of *Poper*y upon any disputed point, may not so prejudice them in their enquiries into things as to leave no Room for debate and mature Consideration.

Secondly, The other head of Objection against the sign of the Cross in Baptism is, *that it seems the introducing of a new Sacrament, which having not the warrant of our Lord and Master Christ Jesus, must needs be a very offensive invasion of his Rights, whose Royal Prerogative alone it is, to institute what Sacraments he pleaseth in his Church.*

This Objection seems to point at a twofold argument. The one, with respect in Common to all those Circumstances in Worship, which for *Decency* and *Order*, are appointed by the Governours of the Church, but not antecedently prescrib'd and enjoyn'd in the word of God. For, to do this, our *Dissenting Brethren* have generally affirm'd it a bold and unwarrantable intrusion upon our *Lord and Master*, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also *Moses* was faithful in all his House, that is, in prescribing to the *Jews* all their modes and usages in Worship, from which they were not to vary or deviate, to add or diminish in any one Circumstance.

This I shall take no further notice of, than as it may necessarily intermix it self with the question particularly in hand about the *Cross in Baptism*, partly because I would keep as strictly as may be to this distinct *Case*, and especially, because this *Case* [of doing nothing in or about the Worship of God, but what is expressly prescrib'd

scrib'd and appointed by *him* in his word] hath been another's province ; so that, I shall only say, the Customs of the Jewish Church it self, (which *our Brethren* would make their main instance in this matter,) do make directly against it. They did unquestionably take up some usages wherein *Moses* had given no antecedent directions, which yet it is evident were not unlawful upon that account, because our *Blessed Lord* did not only not blame or accuse them of Encroachment or Superstition, but *himself* practis'd & comply'd with them; this, amongst many other things, hath been clear'd up in the instance of their Synagogue Worship, and upon another occasion may be further insisted on by and by. Besides, it is plain, this was no Rule amongst the primitive Christians in the first ages of the Gospel, not to add, the inexpediency and unfitness of this Rule to the very Oeconomy and Dispensation of Christianity, which was to diffuse it self amongst all Nations, and all kinds of People, who did so infinitely differ from one another, both in their Customs, and in the Significations of those Customs too, that it must have been a vast and bulky *digest* of Laws indeed, that must have suited all Countries, were every Circumstance and Punctilio in divine Worship to have been antecedently prescrib'd. All this hath been with so much clearness made out by several Hands, that I am apt to think at this time of the day, *our Brethren* do not expect or stand in need of further Conviction in this point, and seem in some measure agreed that this Position of theirs will not hold water.

It is the other part of the Objection therefore, that will fall more directly under our consideration at this present ; and that is, that our using the *sign of the Cross* in Baptism, doth seem to run into the nature of a *new Sacrament*. And this is that they mean, when they tell us,

Sacrament. And this is that they mean, when they tell us, it is an outward Visible sign of an inward invisible Grace, whereby a Person is dedicated to the Profession of, and Subjection to the Redeemer. That it is a dedicating means to consecrate us to God; that it signifies our covenanting engagement, and is as a Badg and Symbol of the Christian Religion; that it represents Christ dying on the Cross, and signifies our being lifted under Christ; that it is an addition to Baptism; that it adds another Sacrament to Baptism: And that it is used as an engaging Sign, in our first and solemn covenanting with Christ, and the duties whereunto we are really oblig'd by Baptism, are more expressly affixt to that aery Sign than to the Holy Sacrament. With many other Expressions of this kind, which we may find interspers'd in the several writings of the Nonconformists, where they take occasion to dispute this Ceremony. This of the Crosses having at least the semblance of a Sacrament, is indeed the only Objection the Presbyterian Brethren insist upon in their exceptions against some passages in the present Liturgy.

As to this therefore, first, I must needs say, I have sometimes wonder'd that the word *Sacrament* it self, hath been so well agreed upon amongst us. The *Fathers* have us'd it so much at large in their writings that it would sometimes be difficult to understand what they mean by it: and our Brethren, upon the same reasons by which several other exceptions have been made, might have disallow'd and rejected it as a word by no means *Scriptural*, but *Pagan* and *Heathenish*. However, since by a long reception of the word into the Church, it seems agreed on all sides, what the Sense and Acceptation of it should be; my business will be to shew, 1. What we are agreed in as to the Notion of a *Sacrament*, and then 2. to make it plain, that as our Church never did design or

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

intend, by the use of the *Cross* in Baptism to make any *new Sacrament* of it; so, in the nature of the thing, it hath not any *semblance of a Sacrament*, according to the Notion of a *Sacrament* that both sides are agreed in.

First, As to our being agreed in the Notion of a *Sacrament*, I must presume our *Church* in her publick catechism, hath given that definition of it, which no reformed *Church*, but approves and allows of. That is, that it is an *outward and Visible Sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace given to us, Ordain'd by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a Pledg to assure us thereof.* It is true, the *Assembly of Divines* in their larger Catechism do in that question of their's [*what is a Sacrament ?*] put in an expression or two, that point at some Opinions, wherein they may be no more agreed amongst themselves, than they are with some of our *Church*. But then, in their next question [*what are the parts of a Sacrament*] they give us the same account with that of our *Church-Catechism*, only a little vary'd in the words, *viz. The parts of a Sacrament are two, the one, an outward sensible sign used according to Christs own appointment: the other, an inward and spiritual Grace thereby signifi'd.* by all which it is evident, we are well enough agreed in the Common acceptation of the word *Sacrament*. And therefore,

Secondly, I proceed to shew, that as our *Church* never did design or intend, by the use of the *Cross* in Baptism, to make any *new Sacrament* of it, so according to the common Notion wherein we are agreed as to the word *Sacrament*, there is not any *semblance of a Sacrament* it can justly be charg'd with.

And here I might, not without some reason, insist, that as we are agreed in the Definition of a *Sacrament*, that both the *outward Sign* must signify an *inward Spiritual*

tual Grace, and also must have its *express institution* and *appointment from Christ*, we, that never suppos'd the use of the Cross in Baptism could confer Grace, nor have ever made the least pretext to any Divine appointment for it, ought not to be charg'd as introducing a *new Sacrament*, when it hath no pretensions to any one thing that is of the Essence of a Sacrament. But I am willing to follow the Argument as they have laid it. They say therefore, that however, we do not call or account it an *Holy Sacrament*, yet forasmuch as we bring a Ceremony into the Church, which in the Significations of it seems *tantamount* to a Christian Sacrament, we do thereby usurp the Prerogative of our great Lord and Master, *setting up our Posts against his Post, and our Threshold again his Threshold.*

This they say we do partly, 1. as we make the Cross a sign betokening our Faith, and Christian courage, when in applying it to the Baptis'd Person, we say we do it *in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ Crucif'd*, &c. And partly 2. when by an intire Representative of *our Church* it is determin'd, that by the sign of the Cross, the Baptis'd Person is *dedicated to the service of him that dy'd upon the Cross.*

First, they say that by making the sign of the Cross *in token that hereafter*, &c. we apply such Significations to it, that run it into the nature of a Sacrament, using it as an *outward Visible sign of an Inward Spiritual Grace.* As to this, we must ingeniously confess, that we make use of no Rite or Ceremony in *our Church*, but it is with this design, that it should be Significant of some thing or other. It would be an odd piece of pageantry indeed, to use this or that gesture or action in our Religious services, that should have no Signification at all in it, and to account it therefore *Innocent*, because it were *Im-*

pertinent. It is the Significancy of it, that makes it useful or proper, and if there were nothing of that in it, it would be very disallowable. But then, though our Ceremonies are significant, and any of them us'd as Memorative Signs to put us in mind of any *Duty* or *Obligation* toward God, they are not therefore an *outward Visible sign of an inward Spiritual Grace*; that is, they are not in the nature of any seal or assurance from God of *His Grace* to us, but hints and remembrances of some *Obligation* we are under with respect to God. And that this kind of significant usages have been all along arbitrarily taken up, without any Imputation of *introducing a new Sacrament*, may be made out, both from the practice of the *Jewish Church*, notwithstanding the punctual prescriptions deliver'd to them by *Moses*. From the practice of the *Christian Church*, and that, both in the very first ages of it, and also in all the later Reformations that have been made.

First, take we a view of the *Jewish Church*; and herein,

1. We may observe that in their very *Passover*, about which, both thing and Circumstances, they had such express directions by *Moses* before they went out of *Egypt*; yet did they in some ages following considerably vary, not only in their time of keeping it, which having been originally appointed on the *Tenth*, they chang'd it to the *Fourteenth* day of the Month: but in the gesture too. In the first institution of it, they were *to eat it with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and staff in their hand*, and all as a token of the haste they were then in. This gesture of eating the *Passover*, it is not so certain how long it continu'd in the *Jewish Church* after their coming out of *Egypt*, as it is unquestionable it was chang'd into a *discumbing* posture (that is, a posture where-

wherein they took their ordinary meals) long before the days of our Saviour, and that so warrantably too, that our Saviour himself used it. And yet, this very posture they had taken up (if we will believe an Expositor that was no great friend to the Ceremonies of our Church) had its Signification too; for he tells us that they did it *in sign of their rest and security otherwise than they had in Egypt.*

V. Ainsw. in
Exod. 12. 3.

2. Another instance in the Jewish Church might be that of the *Altar of Witnesses*, which Phineas, after he had made a jealous enquiry upon, approv'd of, as a standing memorial that they on the other side *Jordan* profess the true God, had Relation to the other tribes, and a Right to the Service of God in the *Tabernacle of the Congregation.*

70sb. 22.

3. But that which seems to come nearest us is what the Jewish Authors do frequently take notice of, and that is, that as to those whose Office entitled them to the *Anointing* (which by all that doth very evidently appear, were only *Kings* and *Priests*) although the *Anointing Oyl*, as to its consecration and ingredients, and the manner of doing it (as one would think) were particularly enough prescrib'd by God; yet did the Jews amongst themselves bring in the use of a Significative sign in doing it, which seems no where disallow'd, or charg'd as an invasion of Gods Holy Institutions: this was, to Anoint the Heads of their *Kings* with the figure of a *Crown*, and their *Priests* with the figure of an *Hebrew* \beth or the *Greek* χ . Not to add, that the *Synagogue Worship*, the *Rites of Marriage*, the *form of taking Oaths*, and the like, things that had great Significations in them, had not the express Institution of God for their warranty, and yet were well enough receiv'd in the purest times of the *Jewish Church*, and comply'd with by our Saviour himself.

Maimon. H.
Melachim.

Secondly, take we a view of the Christian Church, and that, both as to the first ages of it, and all the later Reformations that have been made. 1. We may observe even from the days of the Apostles themselves, the Church hath taken the Liberty of making use of one Rite or other that hath signifi'd things of greatest weight and moment, to instance in a twofold Custom primitively us'd amongst Christians, that lookt much more *Sacramentally* than our use of the Cross in Baptism, that is, the institution of them seem'd Apostolical, being frequently mentioned in their Holy writings; and they were immediately annex't to the Holy Eucharist, and in their Signification bore some analogy with what that Sacrament it self was in part the token and seal of, these were the *Holy Kifs*, and the *Agapæ* or *Feasts of Charity*.

The *Holy Kifs* was perform'd (as the best Writers generally conceive) after all other preparations, immediately before they entred upon the Celebration of the *Lord's Supper*, and at the close and upshot of the whole Solemnity; from whence *Tertullian* gives it the term of *signaculum orationis*, the *Seal of Prayer*. This the Apostle is suppos'd to direct to, when he enjoyns the *Corinthians* to *greet one another with an holy kifs*. And this was kept up with that Reverence in *Tertullian's* time, that he speaks as if the Service of the Publick Prayers were maim'd and imperfect, if it concluded not with *this kifs*. This was us'd *in token* of the mutual Communion and Fellowship that Christians had with one another, and the unfeign'd reconciliation of their Minds, that they came with no inward heart-burnings against one another, being that great Christian Grace and Vertue, so much insisted upon in our Saviour's Gospel; and after that, by his Apostles made one great Evidence of the Professors having *pass'd from Death to Life*. And yet, that this custom had not its

Dr. Caves
prim. Christ.
part 1 Chap.
11. p. 346.
352.

1 Cor. 16. 20.

Que oratio
cum divortio
sancti osculi in-
tegra ? Tert.
de orat.

its Foundation in any *Divine Appointment*, but the voluntary use the Church made of it, seems agreed to on all hands ; because afterward, it is not only prohibited by some Councils, but by an universal consent in all Churches, wholly laid aside, and grown out of all use.

Again, we may observe, as to that custom of the *Agape* or *Feasts of Charity*, which in the Apostles days probably were celebrated immediately before the *Lords* ^{1 Cor. 11. 20,} ^{21.} *Supper*, and in some Ages afterward, not till the *Holy Communion* was finished. But, whether they had them before, or after, it is certain they had great Significations in them, not only of Christians mutual Love and Communion ; but also, of the equal regards that God and our Blessed Lord had, toward all sorts and conditions of Men ; the poor as well as the rich, those of meaner degree and quality, as well as the high and noble, when they were all to eat freely together at one common meal. This the Apostle seems to point at, in the remarks he makes upon the disorders in the Church at *Corinth*, that in their Love-Feasts, *every one taketh before other his own Supper*, and so did *despise the Church of God*. And those that had Houses to Eat and Drink in, *sham'd those that had not*. Now, though this custom was hallowed by the practice of the Apostles, and had so great Significations in it, and was from the first, so annex't to the *Holy Eucharist* that it always either begun or concluded it, and consequently lookt much more *Sacramentally*, than our *Sign of the Cross* in Baptism can be suppos'd to do ; yet is it plain, by the universal disuse of it, in these later ages of the Church, that it self never was esteem'd any *Sacrament*.

I might further instance in the Ceremony of *insufflation*, or breathing upon the Person that was to be Baptis'd, call'd by one of the Fathers an *ancient Tradition*, ^{Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 2. 29.} which

which they us'd as a sign of expelling the Evil Spirit, and breathing into them the good Spirit; this seem'd to signifie more the Grace of God, than Duty of the Christian, and yet not suspected as any Sacrament. Thus, the Baptized Persons stripping of his Garment in token that he put off the Old Man which was corrupt according to his deceitful Lusts, doth it not look full as Sacramentally as our Cross in Baptism? Yet we find it anciently practis'd without any jealousy of invading the prerogative of Christ, in instituting Holy Sacraments. To say no more, what think we of the *trine immersion* once accounted a pious usage in the Church, whereby the Person being thrice dipt or put under water, at the mention of each Person of the *Trinity*, was suppos'd to be Baptiz'd in the belief of that great Article. So *Tertullian* expresseth it, *Nam nec semel, sed ter ad singula nomina, in Personas singulas tingimur.* We are dipped not once but three times, at each name, and so are Baptiz'd into the three Persons. And besides this Signification of the three Persons by this threefold immersion, which *Tertullian*, and not only he, but *St. Ambrose* have mention'd; there are others of the *Fathers* that have suppos'd, the Death, the Burial, and the Resurrection of our Saviour, together with his being in the Grave three days, was signify'd by this custom. And yet, was this so far from being accounted any Sacrament of it self, or a Sacrament within that of Baptism, that the Church hath thought fit to lay *Immersion* aside, for the generality; and the *threefold Immersion* much sooner, particularly in *Spain*, and that upon a reason that made the *single dipping* as significant as the *Trine* had been when it was in use, *viz.* to distinguish themselves from the *Arrians*, who had taken occasion from this *threefold dipping* in Baptism, to assert the three distinct substances, pretending a Testimony from the *Catholic*

Advers. Prax-e.un. Again, in
lib de Coron.
milit,

tholick Church by this usage. Much such a reason (by the way) the Reform'd Churches in *Poland* govern'd themselves by, when in a general Synod they decreed against the Posture of sitting at the Lords Supper, because *that Custom had been brought in first by the Arrians, who, as they irreverently treat Christ, so also his sacred appointments.* Which leads to a view of the Church in all its later Reformatations.

Synod. Petri-
cov. An. 1578.

2. Is it not very evident, that in none of our later Reformatations, nay even in those of our *Dissenting Brethren* themselves, but they do in their most Religious Solemnities, some things that are very Symbolical; Actions that have great significations in them?

1. There giving to every Baptiz'd Infant a new Name. which both they and we do call the *Christian Name*; this seems to betoken *our being made new Creatures, and entred into a new State* or Condition of Life, which still they seem to aim more expressly at, in their general care to give the Child some *Scripture Name*, or some name that should signify, some excellent vertue or Grace, some Religious duty owing to God, or some memorable benefit receiv'd from him. Here we have an *outward Visible sign*, and this too sometimes of an *inward Spiritual Grace*, and yet this no more accounted a *new Sacrament*, or a *Sacrament* within that of Baptism, than we do our *Sign of the Cross*; and indeed there seems just as much reason for the one as for the other, and no more.

2. Those Arguments which some of our *Dissenting Brethren*, have us'd in Plea for the posture of *sitting at the Lords Supper*, do shew, that besides what they urge from the posture wherein our Saviour himself celebrated it, they apprehend some *Significancy* in the gesture, that renders it more accommodate to that ordinance than any other; for, some of them plead for the posture of *sitting*, as being most properly a *Table-gesture* and doth best of

all express *our fellowship with Christ, and the honour and priviledg of Communion with him as Co-beirs.* Now in this matter let us consider; our Lord hath no where expressly Comanded us to perform this Sacrament in a sitting posture; much less hath he told us that he ordain'd *this gesture* in token of *our fellowship with him*; so that, we see *this gesture of sitting* (by the Tenor of their Argument) made *an outward Visible sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace*; and this, not from any antecedent express institution of Christ; which notwithstanding, *this posture of sitting* is not accounted by those that frame the Argument, any *new or additional Sacrament* to that of the Lords Supper.

3. Lastly, Those of the Congregational way have a formal Covenant, which they insist upon, that whoever will be admitted into any of their *Churches*, must engage themselves in; this is of that importance amongst them, that they call it, the *Constitutive Form of a Church*, that which makes *any particular Person Member of a Church.* Yea, and (as another expresses it) that *wherein the Union of such a Church doth consist.* We will suppose then, *this Covenant* administer'd in some form or other, and the Person admitted by *this Covenant* into an *Independant Church* declaring his consent by some Action or other, such as *holding up his Hand*, or the like. Let me ask them, What must they of *that Church* think of this Rite, or Ceremony of holding up the hand? will they not look upon it as a *token* of his consent to be a Church-Member? Here then is an *outward Visible sign*, of What? of no less (according to their apprehension of things) than a perfect *new State and Condition of Life*; that is, of being embody'd in Christ's Church, engag'd to all the *Duties* and enstated in all the *priviledges* of it. Will they say that this way of admission, either the form of words wherein *their Covenant* is administer'd, or the Ceremony

of

of *holding up the hand*, by which this Covenant is taken and assented to, was originally ordain'd by Christ? or do they themselves esteem *this* of the nature of a *Sacrament*? or did the *Presbyterian-Brethren*, in all their Arguments against this way, charge *them* with introducing a *new Sacrament*? So that, from all instances imaginable, both of the Jewish and Christian Church, and that, both Primitive, and later Reformations; even from the particular practices of our Dissenting Brethren, it is very Evident, how unreasonable a thing it is, that though we sign the baptiz'd person with the *Sign of the Cross in token, that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith Christ of Crucifix'd, &c.* We should be accus'd as introducing a *new Sacrament*, or adding the *Sacrament of the Cross* to that of Baptism.

But then, they tell us secondly, we seem to own it our selves, when in an entire Representative of *our Church* (such as we suppose a *Convocation* to be) it is actually determin'd, that by the Sign of the Cross, the Person Baptiz'd is dedicated to the service of *him that dy'd upon the Cross*; and what can be more immediate (saith one of our Brethren) than in the present dedicating act to use the sign, and express the dedicating Signification? It is confess that the 30th. Canon doth say the *Cross is an honourable badg, whereby the Infant is dedicated, &c.* And the stress of the Objection in this part of it lieth in the word *dedicated* that is, because the *Sacrament of Baptism* is it self a *Seal of Admission* into Covenant, and *Dedication* to God, and the *Christian Religion*; therefore, by using a Symbolical Ceremony of humane institution, whereby we profess the Person Baptiz'd, *dedicated to the service of him that dy'd upon the Cross*, we have made a *new Sacrament*, and added to that of Baptism, to dedicate him in our own *invented way* as Christ hath in that which he hath *instituted*.

The Case of the Cross in Baptism, &c.

1. To this I answer, that surely the word *dedication*, is of a much larger Signification, than that it should be confin'd meerly to the Interpretation, that *our Brethren* would put upon it. The meaning of *dedication* properly is, *the appropriating of any thing or Person to any peculiar service*, such as a Church, or Temple for the Worship of God : any Person to the profession the true Religion, to the Ministry, or to any kind of attendance at the Holy Altars. This is the strictest sense of *dedication* ; but then, in a larger sense we may suppose it apply'd to any strict or conscientious discharge of all the Duties, and answering all the ends of the *first dedication*. Thus, suppose a Man ordain'd to the Ministry, whereby he is properly *dedicated* to the work and service of the Gospel ; he may by some solemn act of his own, *dedicate* himself to a zealous and faithful discharge of *that Office* ; and this, after some time that he may have apprehended himself *hitherto* not so diligent in the trust that had been committed to him. This cannot be call'd in any sense a new ordination ; but it may with reason and *sense* enough be stil'd a *dedicating* of a Man's self more particularly to the service of God, in the discharge of that Ministry he was ordain'd to. And therefore,

2. In this sense the Convocation ought in all justice to be understood, when they, in explaining the intention of the Cross, tell us, *it is an honourable badg whereby the Infant is dedicated to the service of him that dy'd upon the Cross, &c.*

And yet, I must needs say, it seems hard measure upon the *Church of England*, that if those in a Convocation should not have apply'd the word *dedication*, to what might be most strictly the sense of it, that this should be so severely expounded, that no other declarations of their meaning and intention must be accepted of, than what meerly the strict and critical sense of *that word*

will bear. Surely there are many expressions in the *Fathers*, that may seem more distant from that sense we are willing to take them in; and we should be very loth to yield them up as the Authors or Defenders of some dangerous Opinions in the *Church of Rome*, because some phrases of theirs in the rigour of them, may be prest to a kind of meaning that may seem to favour *them*. There is a necessary allowance to be given to some schemes of Speech, and meaning of words, or else we should be in a perpetual wrangle and dispute about them.

However, there doth not need even this sort of Charity for this word *dedicated*, upon which such weight of Argument hath been lay'd. For, as in all Authors it hath been variously used, so is it properly enough apply'd in *this Canon*, for the design for which it was used; and the declaration is plain and intelligible enough to the candid and unprejudic'd mind. The word *dedication* (as they use it) may properly enough signify a *Confirmation* of our first *dedication* to God in Baptism, and a declaration of what the Church thinks of the Person Baptiz'd, what she doth expect from him, and what Obligations he lieth under by his Baptism. And as a *medium* of this declaration, the sign of the Cross is made, being as expressive as so many words, what the Infant by his Baptism was design'd to; the Apostle himself having comprehended the *whole of Christianity* under that term and denomination of the *Cross*. Now that our Church did design this *declarative dedication* (by the use of this sign) and none other, is very evident, in that, though the word *dedicated* is used in the explication of their sense in *that Canon*, yet, do they there refer to the words used in the *Book of Common Prayer*. By comparing therefore the *Canon* and the *Office for Baptism* together (the *Canon* directing to the *Office*, and the *Rubrick* belonging to the *Office* directing to the *Canon*) we may observe what stress is to be lay'd up-

on the word *Dedicated* that is, how far they were from designing the same sort of *immediate dedication* that is made by Baptism, and yet how by *the Cross*, we may properly enough be said to be *dedicated* too.

As to the Sacrament of Baptism, we are all agreed that by *that* we are *dedicated* to the Service of Christ, and the Profession of his Gospel; Now the *Church of England*, both in the *Rubrick* and *Canon* do affirm and own, that the Baptism is complete, and the Child made a Member of Christ's Church, before the Sign of the Cross is made use of; or if upon occasion it should not be made use of at all. It is expressly said, *We receive this Child into the Congregation of Christ's Flock*, and upon that, *do sign it with the Cross*. So that the Child is declar'd *within the Congregation of Christ's Flock*, before the Sign of the Cross be apply'd to it. Beside, that *in the Office for private Baptism*, where the Sign of the Cross is to be omitted, we are directed *not to doubt, but that the Child so Baptiz'd is lawfully and sufficiently Baptiz'd*; the Canon confirming it, *that the Infant Baptiz'd is, by vertue of Baptism, before it be sign'd with the sign of the Cross, receiv'd into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, as a perfect Member thereof, and not by any power ascribed unto the sign of the Cross*.

If therefore, we be *dedicated* in Baptism, and the Baptism acknowledg'd complete and perfect, before or without the use of this Sign, the Church cannot be suppos'd ordaining so needless a repetition as this would be, to *dedicate* in Baptism, & then to *dedicate* by the Cross again, but that which they express by *dedicated by the Cross*, must be something very distinct from that *dedication* which is in Baptism; that is, the one is a sign of *dedication*, the other is the *dedication* it self, as distinct the one from the other, as the Sign of Admission is from Admission it self, and a signification of a priviledg, is from an Instituted means of Grace. It seems

seems a thing decent and seasonable enough, that when it hath pleas'd God to receive a person into his favour, and given him the Seal of it, that the Church should give him *the right hand of fellowship*, solemnly declaring and testifying he is receiv'd into her Communion, by giving him the Badg of our Common Religion. So that, this is plainly no other than a Declaration the Church makes of what the Person Baptiz'd is admitted to, what engagement he lies under when capable of making a visible Profession. It expresseth what hath been done in Baptism, which is indeed not a *sign of Dedication* but Dedication it self, (as I have already said) as also the Cross is not *dedication* itself, but a *sign* of it. Which Declaration is therefore made in the name of the Church in the plural number, *We Receive this Child into the Congregation of Christs Flock, and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, &c.* Whereas, in Baptism, the Minister, as the immediate agent of Christ, by whom he is Authoriz'd and Commissionated, in the singular number (as in his Name) pronounceth it, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*

As'to what is urg'd above, that *nothing can be more immediate, than in the present dedicating act, to use the sign, and express the dedicating signification*; they must know, it might have been *more immediate*, either to have plac'd this Sign before Baptism, or to have appointed some such form of words, in applying it as the *Church of Rome* doth; or if it had been pretended to be of divine Institution, and necessary to make the Sacrament of Baptism compleat and perfect.

And thus, I presume, I have run through the main debate betwixt *us* and our *dissenting brethren* as to this Case. Wherein, I hope, I have neither misrepresented their objections, nor let pass any material strength in them, nor in replying to them, used any one provoking or offensive word. Would they but read and weigh this and the other Discourses of this kind, with the same calmness of temper,

temper, and study of mutual agreement, wherewith (I dare say) they have been written; I cannot think there would abide upon their Spirits so vehement a desire for the removal of these things; but it might rather issue in a peaceable and happy closure in the use of what hath been made appear was so innocently taken up, and might with so much advantage, under the encouragement of serious and good Men, be still retained. I do not indeed think any of our Church so fond of this Ceremony particularly, but that, if the laying it aside might turn to as great Edification in the Church, as the serious use of it might be improv'd to, our Governours would easily enough condescend to such an overture. Instances of this have been given in our Age; and our *Presbyterian-Brethren* in their Address to the *Bishops* do own, *that divers Reverend Bishops, and Doctors, in a Paper in Print, before these unhappy Wars began, yielded to the laying aside of the Cross, and making many material alterations, &c.* They have not those apprehensions of *these things*, that they are unalterable, and obligatory upon all Christians, as such; or that the laying them aside, for the bringing about some *greater good* would be offensive to God. I would to God, our Brethren, at least would but meet us thus far, as to throw off those *Superstitious* prejudices they may have conceiv'd against them, and think that as the laying them aside would not be displeasing to God, so the use of them cannot be so neither. Forgive the expression of *Superstitious prejudices*. For I must suppose we put too high a value upon *indifferent rites*, when we think that either the use or rejection of them will recommend us to God, unless there be other accidents of obedience or disobedience to Authority, that will alter the Case. Otherwise the Imagination we may have of pleasing or displeasing God in any of these things, must look like what the *Greeks* express *Superstition* by, I mean, a *causeless dread of God*. It is a passage in *Calvin*, that it is *equally Superstitious, to condemn things indifferent as unholy, and to command them as if they were holy*. It is infinitely a nobler Conquest over our selves, a proper regaining that *Christian liberty* to which we are redeemed, and would be of far happier consequence to the Church of God, to possess our selves with such notions of God, and of indifferent things, as to believe we cannot recommend our selves to him in the least measure by scrupling what he hath interpos'd no Command to make them either Obligatory or Unlawful.

Except. §
Pap. of the
Presbyt. p. 51.

Δεικνυμένη
In 2 Precept.

ERRATA:

Page 9. line 10. read *modesty*. p. 14. l. 5. dele *not*. p. 22. blot out
the last line wholly: p. 28. l. 7. at *moment*, make a full stop,

B O O K S

Printed for

FINCHAM GARDINER.

1. **A** Perswasive to Communion with the Church of *England.*
2. A Resolution of some Cases of Conscience which respect Church-Communion.
3. The Case of Indifferent things used in the Worship of God, Proposed and Stated, by considering these Questions, &c.
4. A Discourse about Edification.
5. The Resolution of this Case of Conscience, *Whether the Church of Englands Symbolizing so far as it doth with the Church of Rome, makes it unlawful to hold Communion with the Church of England;*
6. A Letter to *Ancynimus*, in answer to his three Letters to Dr. *Sherlock* about Church-Communion.
7. Certain Cases of Conscience resolved, concerning the Lawfulness of joyning with Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship. In two Parts.
8. The Case of Mixt Communion: Whether it be Lawful to Seperate from a Church upon the account of promiscuous Congregations and mixt Communions?
9. An Answer to the Dissenters Objections against the Common Prayers, and some other parts of Divine Service prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of *England:*
10. The Case of Kneeling at the Holy Sacrament stated and resolved, &c. In two Parts.

Books Printed for *Fincham Gardiner.*

11. A Discourse of profiting by Sermons, and of going to hear where men think they can profit most.

12. A serious Exhortation with some important Advices, relating to the late Cases about Conformity, recommended to the present Dissenters from the Church of *England.*

13. An Argument to Union; taken from the true Interest of those Dissenters in *England* who profess and call themselves Protestants.

14. Some Considerations about the Case of Scandal, or giving Offence to Weak Brethren.

15. The Case of Infant-Baptism, in five Questions, &c.

16. A Discourse concerning Conscience; wherein an Account is given of the *Nature*, and *Rule*, and *Obligation* of it, &c.

17. The Charge of Scandal, and giving Offence by Conformity, Refelled, and Reflected back upon Separation, &c.

18. The Case of Compelling Men to the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper Considered, &c.

1. A Discourse about the charge of Novelty upon the Reformed Church of *England*, made by the Papists asking of us the Question, Where was our Religion before *Luther.*

2. A Discourse about Tradition, shewing what is meant by it, and what Tradition is to be received and what Tradition is to be Rejected.

3. The difference of the Case between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of *Rome*; and the Separation of Dissenters from the Church of *England.*

4. The Protestants Resolution of Faith, &c.

5. A Discourse concerning a Guide in matters of Faith, &c.

Books Printed for *Fincham Gardiner.*

6. A Discourse concerning *Invocation of Saints.*
7. A Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Catho-
lick Church maintained in the Church of *England.*
8. A Discourse Concerning Auricular Confession.

The Case of Resistance of the Supream Powers Stated and Resolved according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, by *William Sherlock*, D. D. Rector of *St. George Buttolph-Lane, London.*

Consideration of present use Concerning the Danger Resulting from the Change of our Church-Govern-
ment.

A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of *Dr. Stillingfleet's* Unreasonableness of Separation, in Answer to *Mr. Baxter* and *Mr. Lob*, &c.

The middle way betwixt Necessity and Freedom, the First and Second part, by *John Turner* late fellow of *Christ-Colledg* in *Cambridg.*







